REMARKS

DRAWINGS

Proposed amended figures are enclosed herewith.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The change demanded by the Examiner has been made.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 112

The rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 USC 112 is respectfully traversed.

Paragraph 26 has been amended supplying the references demanded by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC 102

The rejection of claims 1 20 is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments.

As amended, claims 1 and 11 now require that the tension member passes through holes in the support member and the object. Support is provided in paragraph 23.

The claims also require that the tension member supports the object when tension (force) is released. Support is provided in paragraph 30.

Further, it is clarified that the tension member is adapted such that the transverse force is less than a threshold amount in response to transverse displacements of the clamping member such that transverse displacement (deviation from an adjusted position) is within a relevant error budget; i.e. the cross section is made such that displacement is limited in a particular way. Support is provided in paragraph 36.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC 103

The rejection of claims 7 - 10 and 11 - 16 under 35 USC 103 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 and 11 have been amended to clarify that the tension member is adapted such that the transverse force is less than a threshold amount in response to transverse displacements of the clamping member such that transverse displacement (deviation from an adjusted position) is within a relevant error budget; i.e. the cross section is made such that displacement is limited in a particular way. Support is provided in paragraph 36.

With respect to Oguma, the point is not to make the shaft stronger, but to make it weaker. The relevant benefit of the invention is that the stiffness of the tension member shaft is reduced, so that it will not exert a transverse force that will move the object.

Oguma, showing a drive shaft in a motor that is necessarily constrained at both ends, is in a field that is totally unrelated to that of the invention (and also totally unrelated to the field of Prescott).

Applicants maintain that one skilled in the art would not combine Prescott and Oguma because the fields are unrelated and the purpose of Oguma resisting massive stresses when a propellor hits an object would ruin the workpiece of Prescott. The braiding stand of Prescott would be ruined if it were subect to the forces of Oguma. In addition, the combination, if made, would not satisfy the limitation that the ttransverse displocemnt is within an error bedget.

With respect to claims 11 - 16, the teachings of Kempkes cannot be combined with Prescott. The claims require that the tension member pass through holes in both the object and the support and that the tension member support (hold up) the object when force is released. Prescott has a tension member passing through one hole, but supports the workpiece on a platform. Kempkes does not have a tension member at all, but a lever.

Thus Prescott and Kempkes may not properly be combined.

It is settled law that the Examiner may not comb through disclosures in one or more unrelated fields and assemble a set of items that meet the literal words of the claims.

There must be a motive for one skilled in the art to make the combination.

In this case, the purpose of the invention is to clamp an object to a support without displacing the object. None of the references teaches anything of the sort.

Thus, even if Prescott or the combination of Prescott with the other references met the limitations of claims 1 and 11, (whichthey do not) the combination would not be valid.

For the foregoing reasons, allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by: Eric W. Petraske, Attorney
Registration No. 28,459
Tel. (203) 798-1857